

supplementary material. It is perhaps unfortunate that its publication coincides with John Gaskin's *Everyman* edition of *The Epicurean Philosophers*, which has a more substantial and useful Introduction and gives a wider range of texts, including the whole of Lucretius.

*The University of Wales, Lampeter*

M. R. WRIGHT

C. LOHR: *Johannis Philoponi Commentariae Annotationes in Libros Priorum Resolutivorum Aristotelis. Übersetzt von Guillelmus Dorotheus*. Neudruck der Ausgabe Venedig 1541 mit einer Einleitung von K. Verrycken und C. Lohr. (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, Versiones Latinae Resuscitatarum Litterarum [CAGL], 4.) Pp. xvi + 87 (text double). Stuttgart, Bad Canstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1994. Cased, DM 261.

This is a facsimile of a Latin translation of Philoponus' commentary on Aristotle's *Analytica Priora*, Book I, published by Guillelmus Dorotheus in 1541. Unlike the modern edition of the Greek original (CAG 13.2, ed. Wallies) the facsimile contains a wealth of diagrams illustrating the structure of the syllogisms discussed in the text. Moreover, the first dozen pages contain *marginalia* which note agreement with other commentators such as Alexander of Aphrodisias, Ammonius, and Simplicius.

Philoponus' commentary is of interest for several reasons. For instance, it contains the first definition of the syllogism in which the conclusion is used to identify the major and the minor (f. 12 r A = 67.27–30 Wallies). Moreover, Philoponus presents the syllogistic of Aristotle as a closely knit system modelled on the science of geometry (f. 12 r A = 66.27–67.13 Wallies). This view had been familiar to Renaissance scholars from medieval logicians who were inspired by Boethius, and was then confirmed by Philoponus' commentary. The agreement between Boethius and Philoponus on this issue may be explained by their dependence on the teaching of Ammonius, son of Hermeias.

The facsimile of the translation is preceded by an introduction by Koenraad Verrycken and Charles Lohr. V. first provides a convincing critique of Prächter's views of the Athenian and Alexandrian schools of Neoplatonism (pp. v–vi). Then he expounds at length his own theory of the development and chronology of Philoponus' thought (pp. vi–xi; see also his introduction to CAGL 5). The reader should be aware, however, that there is no consensus among scholars on this complicated issue.

The *In Analytica priora* is usually attributed to Philoponus' earlier period, which is characterized by his adherence to the Neoplatonism of Ammonius. In support of this attribution L. (p. xi) draws attention to what he regards as one of the very few traces of Ammonian metaphysics in the commentary, namely the doctrine that the eternity of the universe is a necessary consequence of god's goodness (f. 44 v A = 243.17–24, and f. 44 v B = 244.18–25). Unfortunately, in the *In Analytica priora* this doctrine serves to illustrate the construction of a hypothetical syllogism, and Philoponus stresses twice that this type of syllogism does *not* prove that something is the case (f. 44 v A = 243.32–6 and f. 44 v B = 244.16–18). Hence these passages do not provide much insight in Philoponus' metaphysical beliefs at the time he was writing the commentary.

L. provides an introduction to *Analytica priora* I and a concise but illuminating treatment of the history of Philoponus' commentary in the Latin tradition. Once again he has presented us with a fine edition of an influential Renaissance translation.

*Catholic University of Nijmegen, Netherlands*

FRANS A. J. DE HAAS